

## REMARKS

The most recent office action has been carefully considered together with the present application and amendments have been made to several of the claims, most of which amendments are made to correct grammatical usages and improve consistency of terms. Applicants appreciate the examiner's recognition of allowable subject matter. Claims 28 and 30 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 1 and a small portion of claim 6 to make these independent claims. Claim 28 was indicated to contain allowable subject matter. While claim 30 was rejected, it is believed to contain allowable subject matter inasmuch as the subject matter of this claim was argued to be allowable and the examiner failed to address those arguments in the most recent office action.

The examiner has maintained the rejections of claims 1-6, 10-27 and 47-52 and 57-69 as being anticipated by Kardos et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,430,562 (hereinafter referred to as "Kardos") and has rejected the remaining claims (except those of which are now only objected to) under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Kardos in view of Hull et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,487,457 (hereinafter referred to as "Hull").

The examiner has recognized allowable subject matter by only objecting to claims 28-29, 39-43 and 53-56 and indicates these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 28 has been written in independent form as noted above. Apart from the examiner's response to applicants' Amendment A, the rejections that have been maintained with regard to the remaining claims are substantially similar to the original rejections, i.e., those contained in the office action dated October 1, 2003.

The examiner's response to the applicants' amendment states that Kardos clearly teaches integrated resource management system 10, which include the host 12 which receive and/or generate work requests and scheduling requests that are transmitted in the form of messages to the message handler server 14 (Clearinghouse) for retransmission to the mobile work force management system 16. The message handler server 14 allows the plurality of host 12 to each communicate with the mobile work force management system 16 and thus forms an integrated system. The examiner also states that applicants in various sections of his argument alleged Kardos has no inspection capability nor is there selective authorization or operability that is a function of the log-in identity of clients. In response to that characterization of applicant's arguments, the examiner states "in response to applicants argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, (i.e., inspection capability) are not recited in the rejected claim(s)." Applicants note that inspection capability is clearly recited in claim 6 in that claim 6 defines predefined events to include one or more events of a sizeable group. Inspection is certainly involved in certain identified events of the groups, namely, an inspection setup event, an inspection template setup event and an inspection processing event. These inspection events are further defined as well as claims 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, all of which were rejected as being anticipated by Kardos. It is not understood how these claims do not relate to the inspection capability. They are certainly not limitations from the specification that are to be read into the claims.

In response to applicants' argument that the references fail to show their selective authorization or operability that is a function of the login identity of clients, the examiner asserted that "Kardos teaches assigning and generating or scheduling work orders according to the skill of the client. In other words, the OSS server 132 tracks on an aggregate level which technicians are scheduled to work which days as well as their skills in work areas. Based on this information and previously scheduled work, the OSS server 132 generates a schedule that provides time available on a per skill basis. The OSS server 132 is accessed by the host systems 12 and dispatch center 134 to schedule work as needed (see col. 16, lines 43-49). Also Kardos' system includes mechanism for identifying a login identity of the client or technicians and base of this information dispatched predetermined events or work orders to such clients (see col. 19, lines 53-62)".

It is submitted that amended claim 1 is neither anticipated, taught nor suggested by Kardos. The system defined in amended claim 1 comprises at least one server adapted to receive predefined events from a client and forward said events to a clearinghouse via a communication link, and at least one client having a unique login identity and adapted to selectively send said predefined events to said server via said communication link. The final element of the claim states "a clearinghouse . . . being adapted to authorize selected predefined events by each client according to said login identity of such client . . ." It is clear that Kardos does not operate in this manner. It should be understood that a client is defined at page 3, line 12 as a computer which can be personal computers, other computers, mobile computing devices such as PDA's as

well as cell phone devices and that any of these devices would be referred to simply as a client. That being the case, the recitation that the client has a unique login identity is something quite different from what is being described at column 16, lines 43-49. That text states only that the OSS server 132 generates a schedule that provides time available on a per skill basis. Similarly, on column 29, at lines 43-55, it demonstrates that the OSS server 132 merely book work orders against resources on a requested day for individuals that have the “preferred skill set”. An override indicator can prevent an appointment from being booked for people in such a preferred skilled set. This is again repeated at column 30, lines 34-45 where it is discussed that a booking request can be rejected because there are not enough resources to work the order on a requested day. More particularly, the discussion includes “this approach of first sending the request without override and then resending it with override in the event the first attempts fails may be necessary to overcome a limitation in the OSS server 132 which can prevent the appointment from being booked against the preferred skill set when the override indicator is set.” It is clear that Kardos is intending to manage the technicians that are working for the company for the purpose of completing work orders.

The examiner’s reliance on column 19, lines 53-62 is also believed to be misplaced for the reason that all that is being accomplished as described is to send a message to an identified technician so that the identified technician can be dispatched to work on a work order. There is nothing in this portion of the specification to indicate that the technician is a client or that it has a unique login identity or that it is adapted to send anything, and particularly to selectively send said predefined events to said server via

said communication link. There is nothing in any of this cited text that indicates that a clearinghouse is adapted to *authorize selected predefined events that can be performed by each client according to said login identity of each such client*, to selectively schedule events in response to data stored in said database and to monitor the status of all said predefined events stored in said database. The Kardos system simply does not operate in this manner and therefore cannot anticipate the system as claimed, nor is it sufficiently close in its operation that it can teach or suggest the system as claimed.

There is simply no teaching or suggestion in Kardos that only certain, i.e., selected predefined events that are determined according to the login identity of the client are available to be performed by the client. This discerning selectivity that originates with a client is simply not functionality that is carried out by Kardos, either singularly or in combination with Hull.

The arguments that were made in the prior amendment with respect to the other claims were not addressed by the examiner in the office action to which this amendment responds and the examiner's comments regarding the rejections of them are essentially a repeat of the examiner's comments in the first office action. For completeness, applicants repeat those arguments here to make a complete record for appeal.

Claim 4 further defines the system wherein one or more of said server, clearing house and client includes means for defining various levels of authorization for limiting access to predetermined events. Clearly, not only does Kardos not have the log-

in identity as defined in claim 1, but totally fails to anticipate, teach or suggest having various levels of authorization as is set forth in this claim.

Claim 5 further defines the system wherein one or more of said server clearing house and client include predefined templates for selected events wherein said templates comprise a plurality of checklist items and possible responses to said checklist items. Nowhere in Kardos is there even a hint of the use of predefined templates for selected events wherein the templates comprise a plurality of checklist items and possible responses to those checklist items. Kardos simply is not designed to have this capability and therefore cannot anticipate, teach or suggest this claim.

Claim 6 further defines applicants' system wherein said predefined events include one or more events selected from the group consisting of 19 separate events which relate to notification events, tasks events, set up events, work requests and request processing events, as well as work order and work order processing events. Assuming for the sake of argument that Kardos teaches or suggests any of these events, it cannot be honestly concluded that only a few of the events are comparable to those 19 events that are set forth in claim 6. Kardos is not designed to operate in the manner described in this claim and certainly cannot anticipate, teach or suggest a system having this functional capability.

With regard to claim 7, it further defines a system as creating a notification event responsive to preselected ones of said predetermined events not having been completed as prescribed and are therefore overdue. The examiner admits that Kardos is silent regarding the functionality of this claim and cites Hull as supplying the deficiency

in an obviousness rejection. However, Hull fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of this claim because there is no notification event produced by Hull responsive to the event being overdue. The citation to column 12, line 65 to columns 13, line 10 which the examiner apparently relies on is totally misplaced. Hull merely contacts a designated person if the system cannot find utility rates in the context of a building management system. Additionally, Hull does not create a notification event responsive to preselected ones of said predetermined events not having been completed.

With respect to claim 11, it claims a system wherein during preselected ones of said events an authorized client is adapted to add new data, edit existing data or exit said event. Kardos fails to anticipate, teach or suggest this claim because it simply does not operate in the manner whereby an authorized client can add new data, edit existing data or exit the event. Claim 12 should be allowable for similar reasons.

With respect to claim 13, it further defines the system wherein said clearinghouse selectively provides authorization to said client to request events in response to said client communicating its unique log-in identity to the server. Since the Kardos system is not concerned with authorization or unique log-in identities, it is incapable of anticipating, teaching or suggesting the subject matter of this claim.

Claim 14 is similarly incapable of being anticipated, taught or suggested by Kardos for the reason that it does not have a download tasks event that can be requested after authorized communication is established. Moreover, claim 15 further defines additional functionality when during said download tasks event the authorized client downloads task list data from the clearinghouse and determines whether the data is valid

and also determines whether communication with said server is disconnected when the task list data is not valid. Kardos simply is incapable of anticipating, teaching or suggesting the subject matter of this claim because Kardos simply does not operate in this manner.

Claim 16 adds further functionality wherein during one of a download tasks event or an upload task event, said authorized client is adapted to make an entry into an exception log when communication with said one server is disconnected. Kardos does not operate in this manner and the notion of an exception log is not mentioned anywhere in the Kardos patent.

Claim 17 further defines the system of claim 16 wherein during one of said downloads tasks event or said upload task event, said authorized client is adapted to check communication for a predetermined maximum retry count when communication with the server is disconnected and make an entry in an exception log once the predetermined maximum retry count has been tried. Kardos does not operate in this manner and is therefore incapable of anticipating, teaching or suggesting the subject matter of this claim. Claims 18 and 19 define additional functionality during the download tasks event that is incapable of being performed by Kardos and is not anticipated, taught or suggested by Kardos.

Claim 23 further defines the system wherein during said performed task event said clearinghouse is adapted to forward checklist item data for said task to said server. Claim 24 further defines the system wherein during said performed task event said server is adapted to send said checklist item data to said authorized client and claim



25 further defines a system wherein during said performed task event, said authorized client is adapted to display a list of the checklist items from the checklist item data for completing said checklist items. Kardos simply does not operate in this manner because it does not utilize checklists in the manner as claimed. Further, claim 26 defines a system wherein during said performed task event, said authorized client is adapted to respond, skip or stop said checklist item from said checklist item data until all checklist items have been completed. This claim is not anticipated, taught or suggested by Kardos because it does not operate in a manner which utilizes checklists and certainly does not facilitate the functionality whereby the authorized client can respond, skip or stop each checklist item from the data as claimed.

Claim 27 further defines the system wherein during said performed task event, said authorized client is adapted to exit the display as claimed, store response data for said checklist item when the client elects to respond to the same and respond, skip or stop the next item from the checklist item data when said authorized client elects to skip said first checklist item. Clearly Kardos does not utilize checklist items in the manner as set forth in this claim and therefore cannot anticipate, teach or suggest it.

Claim 30 further defines a system wherein performance rating type set-up event allows said authorized server to display an option menu for yes/no type, multiple options type and numerical type performance rating to said authorized client for selection. There is no inspection carried out by either Kardos or Hull and therefore this claim cannot be taught or suggested by either Hull or Kardos. Moreover, since they do not do inspections and are not concerned with any performance rating, they clearly do not

have the capability of displaying an option menu for the various types of performance rating that are set forth in this claim.

Since they do not perform the performance rating type set-up event, neither of these references can teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 31 which saves the performance rating type data onto said database. Further, claim 32 cannot be taught or suggested by Hull or Kardos for the reason that they simply do not define tolerance levels to create a special action event for performance rating data stored in the database. Kardos and Hull cannot teach or suggest this claim because neither is designed to carry out inspections at all, much less carrying out a performance rating or define a tolerance level to create a special action event based on performance rating type data.

Claim 33 is not taught or suggested for the simple reason that neither Kardos nor Hull teach or suggest inspection functionality and particularly the functionality of an authorized client inputting and editing inspection templates data for a specific jobsite. They simply do not have this functionality. Similarly, claim 34 cannot be taught or suggested by Kardos or Hull because they are not concerned with inspection templates data, much less inspection steps that are carried out according to a default checklist item data or a user defined checklist item data stored in said database. The words “inspect” or “inspection” do not appear anywhere in either the Kardos or Hull patents.

Claim 35 further defines the system wherein said clearinghouse is adapted to respond to inspection data sent from an authorized client during an inspection processing event and determine whether the inspection data from said authorized client

are valid. Not only are Kardos and Hull not concerned with inspection capability, neither patent discusses determining whether received inspection data is valid. The only checking that appears to be done by Kardos is to determine whether messages were received, which is completely different from what is claimed.

Claim 36 further defines the system wherein during said inspection processing event the clearinghouse is adapted to make an entry in an exception log when said inspection data is not valid and is not taught or suggested by Hull or Kardos, applied singularly or in combination for the same reasons set forth with regard to claim 35. Claims 37, 38 and 39 are not taught or suggested by Kardos or Hull, applied singularly or in combination for the same reasons that were set forth with regard to claims 30, 31 and 32 relating to tolerance levels.

Claim 46 further defines the system wherein during said work request processing event, said authorized client is adapted to enter an approval code when said authorized client accepts a selected open work request from said list. The notion of a client entering an approval code when said authorized client accepts a selected open work request is simply not a capability that is discussed, inferred or suggested by Kardos. Approval in this context or any context is not even mentioned in the Kardos patent. For similar reasons, claims 47 and 48 are not anticipated, taught or suggested by Kardos.

With regard to claim 49, it defines a system wherein during said work request processing event, said authorized client is adapted to enter an explanation for said selected work request data when said authorized client rejects a selected open work request data stored in said database. Kardos does not teach or suggest the functionality of

the authorized client rejecting a selected open work request data. Any rejection of a work request in Kardos is done at the server level, i.e., there aren't enough resources in the workforce to carry out some requested work. This is a very different functionality. The notion of a client rejecting a work request is simply not contemplated or discussed in Kardos.

Claim 68 is directed to a method for managing operational facilities using predefined events to carry out managing operations for the facilities as claimed and includes the step of selectively authorizing, by the clearinghouse, said events from each client according to said log-in identity of each such client among the other steps as set forth in the claim. Because Kardos does not selectively authorize events according to the log-in identity of each client, it certainly fails to anticipate, teach or suggest this claim. The arguments that are set forth with regard to claim 1 above also apply here. Claim 70 is also believed to be allowable for the same reasons that were advanced with regard to claim 1.

With regard to the dependent claims that were not specifically discussed herein, these claims depend from one or more other claims and necessarily include the subject matter of those one or more claims in addition to reciting further structure and/or functionality not found in those claims. Because of these reasons, it is also believed that these dependent claims are allowable.

For these reasons, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all claims presenting pending in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Roger D. Greer

Registration No. 26,174

May 26, 2004

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978